



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CHEYNE-BLACK ENCYCLOPÆDIA BIBLICA, VOL. I.²

THE appearance of the first volume of a second great dictionary of the Bible in itself would be a matter of no small importance, but it is all the more significant when one recalls that in a large measure it is a legacy of Robertson Smith. In the following pages will be found estimates of various groups of articles, and it is only necessary, therefore, to add a word of preface as regards the work as a whole.

From the mechanical and typographical point of view the work is, with one important exception, a model: the type is small and severely taxes the eye of one reading any considerable time. This defect is only partly offset by the recapitulation in analytic form of sections of long articles, and by an elaborate, though not cumbersome, system of cross-references. The editorial work is open to some severe criticism. The Old Testament articles represent almost uniformly the individual opinions of Canon Cheyne. There is lacking also that editorial perspective which constitutes such a marked excellence of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. That the work is of great importance no one will deny. That it might have been made of better service by a more judicious apportionment of space, and by the inclusion of articles dealing with biblical theology, is also undeniable.

SHAILER MATHEWS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Semitic Philology.—The attitude of the present work toward questions of Semitic philology is marked by broad scholarship and judicious conservatism. The influence of Assyriology is apparent, especially in the articles written by Canon Cheyne, who has recently paid much attention to the subject. But while the great advances made in this and other departments of Semitic research during the past few decades

²*Encyclopædia Biblica*. A Critical Dictionary of the Literary, Political, and Religious History, the Archæology, Geography, and Natural History of the Bible. Edited by REV. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford, and formerly Fellow of Balliol College, Canon of Rochester, and J. SUTHERLAND BLACK, M.A., LL.D., formerly Assistant Editor of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Vol. I, A to D. New York: The Macmillan Co.; London: Adam and Charles Black, 1899. Pp. xxviii + 572 (= 1,144 cols.). Maps and Illustrations. Cloth, \$5. To be completed in four volumes.

are duly recognized, a sound criticism is displayed throughout, and new conclusions are accepted with fitting caution. In dealing with controverted cases, the evidence for the various conflicting views is fairly stated, and there is a notable absence of dogmatic assertion. Fairness of treatment, indeed, is a characteristic feature. A truly scientific spirit prevails, and philological questions involving doctrinal points are treated strictly upon their merits, without theological bias. Conciseness of handling is, of course, the rule, but a wise liberality of space insures the adequate presentation of important subjects. Professor Nöldeke's admirable article on Aramaic Language (cols. 280-86) may be cited as a case in point. The treatment of the very difficult subject of proper names is, in general, most satisfactory, though instances occur, of course, in which the explanations given will not, perhaps, meet with universal acceptance. The argument, for example, in regard to names beginning with Abi-, Ahi-, Ammi-, is not altogether convincing. To deny the occurrence, in such names, of the possessive suffix ך, on the ground that it implies too great "a tendency to individualistic religion," will, to many scholars, appear rather hazardous. The analogy of the cognate languages cannot be so lightly set aside in favor of a theory which can hardly be considered as securely established. Although it may be difficult, at times, to decide whether the "connective ך" represents the genitive or the possessive suffix, the use of the genitive would seem to be well established in a number of cases. The analogy of compound names, like Abdiel, Uriah, Azriel, and Melchisedek, although not containing a designation of kinship, is certainly entitled to some weight. In so complicated a question great caution is necessary, and any sweeping generalization would seem to rest upon rather unstable ground.

While comparative etymology receives, as a rule, its proper share of attention, an occasional omission may be noted. Under Breastplate, for example, Assyr. *siriam* "cuirass" might have been mentioned alongside of שריון, and the citation of Assyr. *çindu*, *çimdu* "team" would have lent support to the explanation of צמר "acre" (p. 38). שקץ "abomination" (p. 21) is certainly connected with Assyr. *siqçu* which occurs as a synonym of *murçu* "disease." Assyr. "bi'lu" (?), cited under Bel, is, of course, a misprint for *bêlu*. The very ingenious explanation of Ashpenaz as a corruption of Belshazzar is at best rather doubtful, while the explanation of מרחק "camp" (col. 636) as "so called from the curving of the tents over their occupants" will hardly meet with general approval. The usual interpretation

of *הָנִיחַ* as meaning "to settle down" is certainly more natural, is in accord with all the passages where the word occurs, and finds support in the analogy of Assy. *kam â su* "to bow, fall down," then "to settle, abide" (Del., *HWB.*, p. 336).

But the few instances of this kind that are to be found here and there are of slight importance when weighed against the very great excellence of the work as a whole. It reflects the best results of modern scholarship in the domain of Semitic philology, and students of the Bible are fortunate in possessing so safe and reliable a guide for questions of this nature.

CHRISTOPHER JOHNSTON.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,
Baltimore, Md.

Assyria and Babylonia.—It is very gratifying to a student of Assyrian to see the important position given to Assyrian in the lexicons of the Old Testament and the biblical encyclopædias. In this volume we have references to the Assyrian and Babylonian on every page, touching the legendary and historical texts; chronology, personal and geographical names, institutions, customs, rites, etc. The contributors have not hesitated through any false conservatism to accept the latest results of the critical schools. Some subjects have received fuller treatment than others. In a few cases one looks in vain for theories, and even facts, which should not have been omitted. With such an abundance of material it is often as difficult to decide what to omit as what to insert. The personal equation must necessarily play a large part. Many of the views presented are tentative, and cannot be accepted as final. Great fairness has been shown, however, in presenting the different views held and in adding a very good bibliography. Reference can be made only to a few articles. Those on Assyria and Babylonia, by Mr. L. W. King, of the British Museum, are splendid examples of what can be done in this topical form. For illustration one may note the contents of the chapter on Babylonia: Names and Description (secs. 1-4), Language and Script (secs. 5-9), Decipherment and Excavation (secs. 10-14), Architecture and Art (secs. 15-18), Literature and Science (secs. 19-24), Religion, Augury, etc. (secs. 25-34), Mythology and Legend (secs. 35, 36), Chronology (secs. 37-39), Historical Periods (sec. 40), Early Semitic Kingdoms (secs. 41, 42), Sumerian Kingdoms (secs. 43-47), Ur, etc. (secs. 48-52),

Babylon (secs. 53-70), Dynasties II-VIII (secs. 56-62), Nabonassar (sec. 63), Assyrian Suzerainty (sec. 64), Neo-Babylonian Empire (secs. 65-70), Bibliography (sec. 71), with a large map. Mention should also be made of the articles Babylon, by T. G. Pinches; Calah, Carchemish, and Chaldee, by C. H. W. Johns.

ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Archæology.—The specialization characteristic of the scholarship of recent years shows itself in a marked degree in the methods of treatment of the themes on Archæology in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. In a total of twenty-five articles we find the names of a dozen writers of note. The general plan of the separate articles is to present in a comprehensive, condensed, and yet sufficiently detailed form the facts current, not only in Israel, but among the most important contemporaneous peoples. In some of these treatments the illustrations found on the ancient monuments furnish an elucidative feature, while in others present-day customs are scarcely less instructive. Agriculture, by Hope W. Hogg, is one of the most comprehensively treated and best-illustrated themes in the encyclopædia. It lays under contribution every valuable source of information concerning this vocation in ancient times. Army, by W. H. Bennett, and Breastplate and Chariot, by O. C. Whitehouse, the last well illustrated, are treated historically, chronologically, and philologically. A. R. S. Kennedy discusses Bakemeats, Bottle, Bread, and Cooking as current among the ancient Israelites, contemporaneous peoples, and in modern Arab countries, especially on the basis of Doughty's investigations. There is some, though not serious, overlapping in matter in some of these articles. Bracelets is treated by Israel Abrahams, while the same writer, with S. A. Cook, discusses Breeches, Crown, and Dress. Breeches is a detailed discussion of the three words found in the Bible and the Versions. Stanley A. Cook has also prepared the articles Candlestick, and Conduits and Reservoirs. This last is based mainly on the investigations and excavations made on and in the site of old Jerusalem. The Candlestick is said on critical evidence not to have been existent before the exile. Such passages as seem to contradict this theory are interpolations, and "the ten candlesticks of the temple of Solomon have probably been evolved from the imagination of a later scribe, who seems to have adopted the number ten to agree with the ten 'bases.'"

Brick, by W. Max Müller, presents both the Egyptian and Babylonian processes of producing this building material, as evidence of the method probably in use by the Hebrews. Alms is by W. E. Addis, Baskets by the editor-in-chief, and Day by Karl Marti. Colours, by Maurice A. Canney, is a very exhaustive treatment of a difficult theme. His article exhibits investigation and large acquaintance with the critical details, archæological and philological, of recent discussions. Aprons, Assembly, Bason, City, Cloth, Clothing, and Dance are anonymous—probably productions of the editorial staff. Assembly and City deserve especial mention for their fulness. The whole body of articles on this theme accords with the general principles laid down in the preface. They reveal everywhere a close sympathy with the critical position of the editor-in-chief, and bear apparently his stamp of approval. They furnish us the best up-to-date exposition of the positions of the “advanced” criticism on biblical archæology.

IRA M. PRICE.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Old Testament Geography.—The articles belonging to this department have been written by thoroughly competent scholars, and it is evident that no pains have been spared to insure completeness and accuracy in this field, in which both qualities are so much to be desired. The most of the articles in this volume are contributed either by Professor George Adam Smith, well known as an expert in the historical geography of Palestine, or by Professor Cheyne, who might well claim to be an expert in almost all branches of Old Testament learning. The former has contributed, for example, the articles Abarim, Abel-Beth-Maachah, Argob, Ashkelon, Ashtaroth, Beth-Dagon, Bethel, Beth-Horon, Bethlehem, Carmel, Damascus, besides a considerable number of shorter ones. These are just such presentations of the material, critical, topographical, and historical, as one wishes to see in a Bible dictionary for students. The article Damascus (furnished with a good special map of the district) deserves particular mention both for its completeness—notice especially the light thrown on the history of the city from extra-biblical sources, from the earliest times—and as an example of a thoroughly satisfactory method. The treatment of Beth-Horon is another good illustration of this latter quality. In the article Beth-Eked, the proposed emendation of the text of 2 Kings 10: 12 is not a happy one. The text of the verse is troublesome, to be

sure, but the word תִּפְּ is the last that one should attempt to correct. It might have been well to mention the *Baṭṭakath* of the *Onomasticon*, little as that helps us. The reading of the Peshitta in vs. 14 is given incorrectly; the name is written with פ.

Professor Cheyne's chief contributions are Abana, Adullam, Aijalon, Ain, Arad, Arphaxad, Bahurim, Bela, Bethany, Beth-Arabah, Beth-Haccerem, Caphtor, Dan. These, though sometimes difficult reading (see for example Ain), may be relied on to take into account all the available material, and to give full references to the literature, even the latest. The painstaking care and great learning of this tireless editor are everywhere manifest. The scholar will find his chief needs met in such articles as Arphaxad, Beth-Arbel, which the average reader will find very confusing. In a few cases new theories are advocated without the caution which might reasonably be looked for. Caphtor, for example, is confidently located in the southwest of Asia Minor (so also on the map attached to the article Assyria), though not even the equation Egyptian *Keftō* = Cilicia is yet proven, to say nothing of the other difficulties, headed by the unexplained א at the end of the Hebrew name.

The articles Abel-Shittim, Beth-Marcaboth, and Aphek are by the late W. R. Smith; Stanley A. Cook deals satisfactorily with Ashdod, Beth-Shean, Beth-Shemesh, Desert, and Dor; Driver writes on Bashan and Beth-Peor. The article Aram is by Nöldeke; Ararat, by Kusters; Canaan, Canaanite (fully and satisfactorily treated), by Morris Jastrow, Jr.; Carchemish, by C. H. W. Johns; Dead Sea, by Professor Gautier, of Lausanne. In each and all of these there is manifest the same adequate appreciation of the problems to be solved, and of the needs of the modern student. One of the characteristic excellencies of this *Encyclopædia* may be seen in the way in which profane literature, and especially the evidence furnished by the Semitic and Egyptian inscriptions, is everywhere brought in to help in illuminating or solving these geographical questions.

CHARLES C. TORREY.

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Zoölogy, Botany, and Mineralogy.—The separate articles under these three departments of natural history in the Old and New Testaments are treated with the philological, analytical, and critical thoroughness characteristic of other departments of this *Encyclopædia*. The articles on Badger Skins, Bear, Bee, Bittern, Camel, Cormorant were

prepared by Norman McLean and A. E. Shipley. They exhibit a sound knowledge of their subjects, and of the history of opinions in earlier times. Their work is greatly enhanced by the presentation of the present zoölogy of the East. Cattle, and Dove are the joint production of A. E. Shipley and J. A. Cook. Bird is unsigned, while the editor-in-chief has made additions to Camel, and has himself written Behemoth and Dog. In the article Behemoth he includes likewise a discussion of Leviathan. In the midst of the article he says: "In the present article we shall desert the zoölogical explanation of Behemoth and Leviathan, leaving the field open to another writer to represent the more generally received opinion (see Hippopotamus, Crocodile). Strong reason will have to be shown for not interpreting these strange forms with some regard to mythology." The author practically adopts the position of Gunkel in his *Schöpfung und Chaos*. He concludes that "the Behemoth and Leviathan passages in Job represent a fusion, from every point of view most natural, of Babylonian and Egyptian elements." He also calls into evidence the strange passages of apocryphal literature, especially those of Enoch and of Esdras. We are surprised that Gunkel's treatment is thought to be somewhat exaggerated.

The botanical articles, Almug, Aloes, Apple, Balsam, Bdellium, and Cedar, are the joint production of Norman McLean and Sir W. T. Thiselton-Dyer. They are treated with sufficient fulness for all practical purposes. The identifications of early writers are often of great interest and valuable testimony, because they lived nearer biblical times and places than we of the nineteenth century. To the article on Almug we find an appropriate editorial note of value, mentioning the fact that Sennacherib used in the construction of his palace *ēlammāku* wood. Brier is signed by Norman McLean, and Bush by N. M. and G. B. Gray. The botanical articles as a whole exhibit fuller philological and historical material than the same articles in the Hastings *Dictionary of the Bible*, while, on the other hand, the latter present a somewhat larger view of the modern identified species under discussion.

Among the articles on Mineralogy, Amber, Amethyst, and Beryl are signed by William Ridgeway. The author of these articles has gathered material from every available source, and, especially in the case of Amber, presents a very exhaustive study of the subject, lexically, historically, and scientifically. Alabaster and Brimstone, unsigned, are less satisfactory in their conclusions. Coal, by A. R. S.

Kennedy, and Copper, by the editor-in-chief, are discussed from the point of view of philologists and exegetes rather than of scientists, but are nevertheless valuable for Old Testament scholars.

Although space is valuable in a biblical encyclopædia, we have a feeling that, under the articles on zoölogy and botany, some good illustrations of the modern identifications, if these identifications have any real value, would be exceedingly instructive to the student of the Scriptures.

IRA M. PRICE.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Old Testament History and Biography.—The articles in the department of Old Testament biography and history are numerous. In the treatment of unimportant personages, however, this *Encyclopædia* is more economical of space than the *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible*, since the necessary information in these cases is compressed to the narrowest possible limits. To the more important persons ample space is given, and the extant material concerning them is treated with a critical thoroughness which leaves little to be desired. The articles which deal with Hebrew personalities are, with a few exceptions, written by Cheyne and Addis. The former treats Abimelech of Gerar, Achiacharus, Achish, Achsah, Ahab, Asa, Benhadad, Cushan-Rishathaim, and David; the latter, Abiathar, Absalom, Adonijah, Ahaziah, and Bathsheba; while both unite their labor on Ahaz. A commendable sifting of the material, followed by historical reconstruction, characterizes all these articles. Ahab lives again before us, not as a religious renegade, but as an astute politician and a dauntless warrior; we take with Absalom anew all the steps of his great treachery and rebellion, while David, with all the rawness of a crude age, lives before us his life, not that which the past has piously fancied for him, but one generous and noble nevertheless, when compared with the men of his time. Persons mentioned in Judges are similarly treated by Moore. The articles on the Persian kings, Ahasuerus, Artaxerxes, Cyrus, and Darius, are by Tiele and the late Professor Kusters. They take a moderate, middle ground with reference to the various critical problems connected with the return from the exile. Tiele thinks that Gobryas, whom Cyrus made governor of Gutium, on the Median frontier, was afterward confused with Darius for whom he fought, and so became Darius the Mede of the book of Daniel. Hogg in the article on Asher discusses the various theories of the origin of the tribe, but comes to no

conclusion. Kamphausen in the article on Daniel holds to the unity of the book, and that the Daniel of the exile was not a historical character.

The most valuable contribution to Old Testament history in this volume is Marti's article on Chronology, which is a masterly treatment of a difficult subject. The article is considerably longer than the corresponding article by E. L. Curtis in the *Hastings Dictionary*. Marti demonstrates in a most convincing way the untrustworthiness of all the chronological statements in the Old Testament, including the synchronisms in Kings, weighs Mahler's astronomical data in the balance and finds them wanting, searches Egyptology in vain for chronological help, and at last, finding a secure scientific basis in Assyriology and the canon of Ptolemy, reconstructs the Old Testament dates in so far as that is possible. This work had been done in parts before, but to have it done so thoroughly, and the results brought together in so small a compass, is a distinct gain.²

GEORGE A. BARTON.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE,
Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Old Testament Introduction.—The more important articles of this volume on Old Testament Introduction are Amos, Canticles, Chronicles, and Daniel. The article on Amos is by Cheyne, and it discusses very satisfactorily the most important points, special attention being given to the post-exilic insertions. The older view, that Amos came from the southern kingdom, is adopted, and difficulties urged against it are answered. Israel is so much more important than Judah, in religion, in politics, and in literature, as to furnish satisfactory explanation for the special action taken by Amos. Tekoa, famous for the quick wits of its inhabitants, may be accepted as the home of Amos. He had studied the conditions of life and thought in the northern kingdom.

The story of the Man of God from Judah (1 Kings, chap. 13) is thought to be a late distortion of the tradition contained in Amos 7:10-17, in which Amos threatens the northern kingdom with extinction, and with this story Cheyne compares, with Klostermann, Amos 3:14; 7:9, and 9:1.

²Col. 790 in Table III against 726-722 read Shalmaneser IV., instead of Shalmaneser III.

In the times of Amos the Israelites have no expectation of an immediate attack from Assyria. The successes of Jeroboam II. were due to the fact that Assyria was occupied with revolts at home. The people are in the midst of great prosperity. The tone of Israelitish society is optimistic, although there is occasional thought of past afflictions. The upper classes are self-indulgent; feasting is habitual. Along with this condition of society there is strong interest in religious ritual.

The nation which, according to Amos, will come against Israel is without question Assyria, and the date assigned is an early one, namely, between 765 and 750. If the latter date is taken, the form of threat, in view of the events connected with Tiglath-Pileser III., would have been fuller and more precise.

Canon Cheyne's analysis of the book is the least satisfactory part of his treatment. After setting apart chaps. 1: 2—2: 16, and, on the other side, chaps. 7—9, in which, of course, he is correct, he analyzes chaps. 3—6 into ten loosely connected passages, and understands that the triple division is a result reached by a later editor with considerable difficulty. The discussion of insertions is full and satisfactory, and yet nothing essentially new is here suggested. But, after removing those passages called insertions, allowance must also be made for pre-exilic editors. No reasons are assigned by him why it is inherently difficult and contrary to knowledge to suppose that 1: 2—2: 16 was never really uttered; and we see no reason for supposing that the visions in chaps. 7—9 were not used as the text of spoken addresses.

It is an interesting suggestion that the prophet may have written down his prophecies while in Jerusalem, after having been expelled from northern Israel.

While Amos had models, both as a writer and speaker, his book may be regarded as forming "a literary, as well as a prophetic, phenomenon," and his originality appears in his being perhaps the first to conceive the idea of using the pen in aid of the voice. In doing this he was following the example of the literary priests.

Amos was essentially pessimistic, and the ground of this pessimism was the increasingly unsound condition of his people. His God was the sovereign of nature and of history. Amos was an ethical monotheist. This view of Amos and his work is essentially correct.

The article on Canticles is also from the pen of Cheyne. The treatment includes a history of the interpretation, with an explanation of the origin of the allegorical interpretation.

The discussion of the poetical form, involving the question of its dramatic or lyric character, is the essential part of the article. Two arguments are urged against the possibility of the dramatic hypothesis; namely, the lack of a plot, and the impossibility of the existence of a drama among Semitic peoples. It is only fair to say that it requires no more imagination to discover the materials for a plot than to comprehend some of the considerations urged against this supposition; while of those who advocate the dramatic view no one may be found who would maintain that the drama here found is anything more than in germ. As there is no real philosophy among the Hebrews, so there is no real drama; but there is a wisdom which answers for philosophy, and so here may be found a composition which is, perhaps, a crude attempt in the direction of the drama. The writer himself acknowledges that the colloquies in the book of Job have a distant affinity to the drama; that the stories of Jacob and Samson contain distinctly dramatic passages. This, now, is all that is to be expected, for it is not to be supposed that any theatrical performance of the Song of Songs was ever intended. We cannot, therefore, agree with the writer when he says that the difficulties of the dramatic theory are insuperable.

The view adopted is that first elaborated by Budde, on the basis of information respecting Syrian marriage customs, given in 1873 by Consul Wetzstein. During the seven days after the wedding the bridegroom and the bride are treated as king and queen. In the evening of the great day a sword dance is performed, and in the Syrian wedding festivals the sword dancer is the bride—a relic of the primitive marriage by capture. Compare 6:10, 13 and 7:1-6. In accordance with this view, the most striking part of the song is 7:11-8:7 (8:3-5 being an interpolation). But the writer states that this view is imaginary in its details, since the incidents are inconsistent with what was allowable in courtship. It must be confessed that the arguments of Budde and Cheyne, while plausible, are not finally convincing. The greatest arguments for the lyric theory are (1) the simplicity of the theory, and (2) the skill of the Israelites in the lyric. If, however, the lyric view is to be accepted, we must, with Cheyne, agree that the book has no religious value whatever, and that "the mistake of a Jewish synod cannot be perpetually indorsed by Christian common-sense and scholarship." In this case the meaning of the word "canonical" must be changed.

Driver's treatment of Chronicles is briefer in proportion to the importance of the subject than the other articles which come under the head of Old Testament Introduction. He agrees with most recent writers that the books of Chronicles are continued in Ezra and Nehemiah, and with Ezra and Nehemiah form one book. But the writer must have lived a considerable time after Ezra, and probably in 300 B. C. While the books of Kings present Israelitish history from the point of view of the prophets, the chronicler writes from the point of view of the priest. In the former the environment is national; in the latter it is ecclesiastical. The center of life, from the point of view of the chronicler, is the liturgical service. Israel now finds her mission in the temple, the solemn assembly, and the feast day. The writer of Chronicles deals, therefore, with those things in the past which stand related to his immediate present. Everything inconsistent with his present position must be condemned.

It is now probable that the writer of Chronicles was quite dependent upon the writer of Samuel and Kings. The attitude of the writer toward high places and the references to the Levitical choirs proceed upon the assumption that the background of Israel's history has always been the same as in his time. Special emphasis is placed upon the doctrine of divine retribution, and effort is made to show that it acts immediately. Much of the material of the book is in the style of the Jewish Midrash, or moralizing romance, making use of historical names and events. Another peculiarity is the frequent exaggeration in which the writer indulges.

This treatment is from the same point of view as that which is to be found in Driver's *Introduction to Old Testament Literature*, and may be regarded as a strong and conservative presentation of views which are now largely accepted.

It is Adolf Kamphausen who furnishes the treatment of the book of Daniel. The aim of the book, it is maintained, is exhortation and encouragement, and it contains several more or less detached and independent pictures, written for the contemporaries of the tyrant Antiochus IV. The writer adopts the grouping of Ewald, which arranges the book in ten pieces, classified in three parts: the first, an introductory part, chaps. 1 and 2; the second, containing four narratives, chaps. 3-6; and the third, containing four prophetic pieces, chaps. 7-12. The book possesses, without question, unity, notwithstanding the interchange of language which it contains. We cannot think that the writer's explanation of the use of the Aramaic language

is, on the whole, more satisfactory than some others that have been urged. He suggests that the change came about because the author wishes to have the Chaldeans, who have been introduced in chap. 2, speak the language which is supposed to be their native language; but when this speech has been finished, he continues himself to use the Aramaic language, because it is more convenient for himself and for his readers; but, when he reaches the eighth chapter, the Hebrew is resumed again, as having been the sacred language of the prophet.

The aim of the book was not the communication of historical information. Daniel, like Job, is not to be tried by the standard of strict historicity. The book manifests "a magnificent unconcern about historical possibilities." The writer goes so far as to oppose the view of Driver that Daniel was a historical personage.

The treatment is thoroughly iconoclastic, and presents the extreme form of the modern critical theory concerning Daniel.

In general it is impossible to characterize these articles as a whole. Each has its peculiar merits and its distinctive defects. Space is not permitted to present the excellent treatment of Deuteronomy by George F. Moore. Each article shows the strength and the weakness of the writer.

WM. R. HARPER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

The Pentateuch.—The largest number of articles dealing with the Pentateuch in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* are written by the editor-in-chief, Professor T. K. Cheyne. From his pen come the following contributions: Abel, Abi-, Abraham, Adam and Eve, Ammon, Ark, Arphaxad, Azazel, Babel, Benoni, Cain, Cainites. Next in number are the articles by Hope W. Hogg, on Asher, Benjamin, Bilhah, Dinah. Professor George F. Moore has contributed the article on Deuteronomy and the articles on Ashtaroth, Asherah, and Baal, which also have points of contact with the Pentateuch. The articles on Aaron, Balaam, and Decalogue are by W. E. Addis; those on Creation and Deluge, by Heinrich Zimmern and T. K. Cheyne; Canaan is by Morris Jastrow, Jr.; Chedorlaomer, by C. P. Tiele and L. W. King; Covenant, by Nathaniel Schmidt; Circumcision, by Immanuel Benzinger; Amalek and Aram, by Theodor Nöldeke.

The standpoint of all these articles is substantially the same as that of the editor-in-chief. Professor Cheyne belongs to the radical wing of Old Testament criticism, and he has selected as collaborators those

who share in his views. This fact gives the articles on the Pentateuch in this encyclopædia a more radical tone than is to be found in any English publication of equal importance. Here there is no shrinking from conclusions, and no hesitation in expressing them. The words "myth, legend, fiction, perversion" are used with a frequency never before seen in a work intended for the general Christian public. On the accounts of creation it is remarked that "it may be regarded as an axiom that the descriptions of creation contained in the biblical records, and especially in Gen. 1:1—2:4a, are valuable only in so far as they contain certain religious truths which are still recognized as such. To seek for even a kernel of historical fact in such cosmogonies is inconsistent with a scientific point of view." In regard to the origin of the Hebrew creation-myths, Zimmern holds that in their present form they are not a survival of primitive Semitic tradition, nor an inheritance from the Canaanites, but that they are a working up of fragments of old mythology under Babylonian influence at the time of the Babylonian supremacy.

The story of Cain is pronounced by Cheyne a myth designed to explain the curse that rested upon the Kenites, compelling them always to remain nomads. The antediluvians are all ancient Semitic deities. Enoch is the same as U-NUK, Sumerian for the city of Erech. The deluge, according to Zimmern, is not a historical event, but an "ether-myth" which has arisen independently in widely separated races. Abraham, according to Cheyne, is the eponym hero of the district of Hebron. His marriage with Sarai is the traditional form of the memory of a union of a south-Israelitish tribe with a non-Israelitish tribe. Abraham's connection with Hagar expresses a political relation of the Israelites to Egypt. The names of the patriarchs are all the names of Hebrew clans, and the stories of their lives are nothing more than traditions of the migrations and changing political fortunes of the clans in question. The ark was a simple box, without ornamentation, carried about by the nomadic Hebrews. It contained no tables of the law, but rather two fetiche stones. The decalogue, according to Addis, has not even a Mosaic nucleus, but is wholly the product of the period shortly before the exile.

Whatever one may think of the correctness of the critical conclusions reached in this encyclopædia, one cannot fail to be impressed with the excellence of the work done. The writers are masters of their respective subjects, and have brought to bear upon them a prodigious amount of labor and of learning. Here one finds, as in no other

work in English, a summary of modern thought on all subjects connected with the Pentateuch. The references to literature, which are remarkably complete, alone are worth to the student far more than the cost of the work. The longer articles, such as those of Nöldeke on Amalek and Aram, of Moore on Deuteronomy, of Zimmern on Creation and Deluge, of Schmidt on Covenant, and of Jastrow on Canaan, are as admirable monographs on the subjects in question as it is possible to find in any language. This is a work that every student of the Old Testament will need to add at once to his library.

LEWIS B. PATON.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Hartford, Conn.

History of Religious Institutions, Ideas, etc.—The principles on which the *Encyclopædia* is based make this part of its contents very extensive and significant. It professes to prepare the way for biblical theology, but not to make any direct contributions to it. The history of institutions and the history of ideas must first be determined before we can hope for any adequate treatment of that subject. Hence all the biblical theology which appears in this work is found in the contributions under these categories. Hence also extraordinary diligence has been exercised to reach the highest standard of efficiency and to make the most ample contributions in this preliminary field.

The conception of development rules supreme in the treatment. Hebrew religion is traced back to the old Semitic ground. Points of contact with foreign cults are brought forward. Foreign gods receive ample treatment, and their influence on Israel's life is detailed. Semitic mythology is postulated for the elucidation of a number of Hebrew conceptions. Ideas are traced historically through the stages of Israel's life as revealed in the Old Testament books. Contradictions in the views and attitudes of different periods are unsparingly revealed. The faith of one age appears as the heresy of another. A good example of this is the article on Angels.

The articles are singularly objective. This quality appears in two directions: first, in the almost complete absence of judgments as to the value of the ideas and institutions whose history is so learnedly traced; and, secondly, in the absence of expressions suggesting sympathy with or appreciation of the positions or conceptions of the biblical heroes and teachers. This is not to say that the *Encyclopædia* is thereby defective. Certainly one does not look for homilies, laudations, or ecstasies in a

Bible dictionary, but for plain statements of fact. Yet, the atmosphere is not unimportant, and from that point of view the most of these articles suggest the surgeon and the operating table, where the good result sought is not in any way complicated with feeling for the patient. Moreover, it would be of real service to the reader to have in many cases the writer's view of the actual value of the institution or idea both in the time in which it was supreme and as a permanent contribution to thought and life. We miss this, for example, in the article on the Decalogue, which is concerned entirely with the form, and in that on Covenant, which is otherwise so admirably prepared.

One must also notice that not a few of the articles are so concerned with details and the development of phases of the subject considered that they do not bring us out anywhere. This, again, may not be a weakness, but rather a recommendation of a Bible dictionary. The student who consults this dictionary on any topic wants, not a summary statement, but the full treatment of all phases and forms of the subject. This he will for the most part obtain in a very satisfactory fashion subject to the limitations already suggested. But he will have to form his own conclusions. Take, as an example, Bousset's Antichrist. Could anything be more learned, more satisfactory on particular points discussed? But when we have finished it the impression of the whole is singularly unsatisfactory, because the writer leaves us in the air; he has not come to any point. The same is true of a number of similar articles.

But it would not be fair to conclude this brief comment without emphasizing the remarkable learning revealed in almost every discussion in this important field of religious institutions and ideas. The articles are stimulating, if not edifying, and no student of the Bible who is seeking the largest outlook on the present achievements of biblical learning can afford to pass them by. It is a real satisfaction to find American scholars so well represented. There are no finer articles in the *Encyclopædia* than those by Professors Moore and Schmidt.

Two misprints only have caught our eye. In col. 840, footnote 2, line 3 from bottom, *rising* should be *ruins*. In col. 1074, in the first line of the bibliography to article Demons, *Nevins* should be *Nevius*.

G. S. GOODSPEED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Apocalyptic Literature.—It is but the just recognition of the fine, scholarly work of Professor Charles upon Apocalyptic Literature that in both of the recent Bible dictionaries this theme has been given to him for treatment. In the Hastings *Dictionary* the general subject is briefly handled after the manner of an introduction, and then each book belonging under it is discussed in its proper place. Here, in an article extending over thirty-six columns, the writer has set forth in clear, compact form the best results of all recent study upon those apocalypses, the right understanding of which contributes so largely toward an intelligent appreciation of Judaism just before and during the times of Jesus. A "right understanding" of these works has been in large part the outcome of a correct discernment of their structure and parts. Scholarship owes no small debt to Professor Charles for the painstaking inductive study by which he has helped to this discernment. There is, of course, the element of subjective criticism in this kind of work, and opinions will not always agree regarding dividing lines, but the writer makes it abundantly evident that the following matters are beyond question: the composite character of all these apocalypses, their Pharisaic tone, their complex authorship, and their varied teachings, the last being due to different date and outlook, as well as to different authorship. As a result, we realize that the period immediately preceding the advent was one of surprising literary activity. From 200 B. C. to 100 A. D. these substitutes for the word of true prophecy appeared at intervals, inspiring the nation to fidelity and zeal. The strength of this whole presentation in apocalyptic literature lies in the independent, careful, analytic exposition of the various books. In this particular no better nor, in general, more convincing work has been done. The article is a mine of information regarding those conceptions which Jesus had to antagonize throughout his ministry.

The description of the book of Baruch, by Professor Bevan, is derived from the same critical methods. He separates the book into four parts. Interest centers chiefly in the date of the portion 1:15—3:8, which may well have come from the later part of the Persian period, but this otherwise helpful article leaves the matter entirely undecided. Composite authorship is maintained.

The relation of Alexander the Great to the Jews is mainly of interest through the story of his advance to Jerusalem, as given by Josephus (*Ant.*, XI, 8, 3). Suspicion is justly cast upon this narrative. It is certainly legendary in its details, if not in its main assertion, having all the marks of the ambition of Josephus to glorify his own people.

Among the mischief-makers in Jerusalem in the time of Judas Macabæus none was more troublesome than Alcimus. Within the compass of a page his career is concisely set forth and its importance estimated. The article is valuable for its judgments upon the character of the sources out of which the history of this persistent and presumptuous Hellenist is drawn.

JAMES STEVENSON RIGGS.

AUBURN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Auburn, N. Y.

New Testament Introduction.—The greater interest which for the moment attaches to the Old Testament as compared with the New is almost startlingly exemplified in the *Encyclopædia*. Twenty-six columns are devoted to the canon of the Old Testament, while Canon Armitage Robinson is restricted to seven for the New. No wonder some recalcitration vents itself in the words: "A brief outline of a subject of the highest importance, which bristles with points of controversy, has necessarily passed over in silence a large portion of the evidence." Worse than that, it passes over in silence much which anyone who consults the encyclopædia may justly expect to find. Canon Robinson has compressed into his seven columns such a history of the growth of the canon during the first two centuries as was possible only to an expert, but the causes at work in developing it even during this period are but scantily exhibited, while necessarily nothing is said regarding the selection of the precise contents now accepted by the church and nothing of the test of canonicity.

Six books of the New Testament are dealt with in this volume. The Acts of the Apostles has been intrusted to Professor Schmiedel. He finds that, apart from the "we"-sections, "no statement merits immediate acceptance on the mere ground of its presence in the book." For proof of the writer's "inaccuracies" he returns to the old, trifling, and, we had supposed, discredited criticism of the discrepancies in Paul's various accounts of his conversion. Professor Ramsay's defense of Luke as a historian is treated cavalierly and superficially. The "aim" of the writer, according to Schmiedel, is "to justify the Gentile Christianity of himself and his time, already on the way to Catholicism." Why justify this to Theophilus, and in the period of 105-130 A. D., to which the authorship is referred? More satisfactory is the fair account and criticism of Blass' theory of the text, to which a large part of the article is devoted.

The Apocalypse naturally fell into Bousset's hands, and the volume includes no more thorough or competent article. Its only weak point is the argument regarding the authorship. Bousset cannot find two Johns in Asia Minor, but one; and he not the apostle, but the presbyter. Even the presbyter is not *directly* the author of gospel and Apocalypse. The date is toward the close of Domitian's reign, but the interpolations are of course variously dated. A lucid account is given of the theories that have contributed to the understanding of the book, and the criticism is that of a scholar who has long been familiar with every aspect of the large and difficult subject.

Professor Jülicher writes judiciously on Colossians and Ephesians. Of the genuineness of the former he has no doubt. The external attestation is "the best possible," and, although there are peculiarities of style in the first half of the epistle, these are outweighed by the genuine Pauline element. To the substance of the letter objection has been taken. The Christology is in advance of Paul's. "But why should not Paul himself have carried it on to this development in view of new errors, which demanded new statements of truth?" In fact, "the number of those who doubt its genuineness does not grow." It was written probably from Rome in 63 A. D. Ephesians is a circular letter, by whom written it is hard to decide. Professor Jülicher inclines to the opinion that its author was a Paulinist, who about the year 90 A. D. sought to put in a plea for Paul's idea of Catholicism; but "perhaps the question ought to be left open as not yet ripe for settlement, and Ephesians in the meantime used only with caution when the Pauline system is being construed."

For the two epistles to the Corinthians Professor Sanday has not been allowed nearly as much space as is allotted to Canticles. But in this narrow room his recognized knowledge and caution furnish a model article. The integrity of the second epistle is proved against Pfeleiderer and Schmiedel; and evidence is given to show that there are two lost epistles to Corinth.

MARCUS DODS.

FREE CHURCH COLLEGE,
Edinburgh, Scotland.

New Testament Geography.—The articles in this department of the *Encyclopædia* are almost wholly the work of two authors, Mr. W. J. Woodhouse, lecturer in classical philology, University College of North Wales, Bangor, and Dr. George Adam Smith, professor of

Hebrew and Old Testament exegesis at the Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland. Mr. Woodhouse writes upon Achaia, Alexandria, Antioch, Asia, Athens, Bithynia, Colosse, Corinth, Crete, Cyprus, and other minor localities; Professor Smith writes upon Antipatris, Arbela, Bethlehem, Cæsarea, Capernaum, Damascus, Decapolis, etc. All of the work is well done; some of it is very well done. It could not be expected, however, that men who are not strictly speaking New Testament scholars would give these articles the specific and exact treatment which was needed.

Mr. Woodhouse's Alexandria, for instance, is an excellent general article, but the very matter for which it finds a place in a biblical encyclopædia is omitted, namely, the part which Alexandria played in Jewish and Christian religious history. Similarly, Antioch in its relation to Christianity receives a wholly inadequate treatment. The author says this "city was the cradle of the church," which is a bungling statement; also that the title "Christians" was a nickname given by a people who were noted for their scurrilous wit—a sort of statement which belongs to unscientific literature on the Acts. The article Athens contains a trenchant criticism of the customary views of Paul's experiences in that city, and the point is certainly well taken, although the language concerning Paul is too severe. The article Corinth is disproportionately brief; here, too, as in the articles Alexandria, Asia, and often, there is no bibliography attached, a serious defect. The articles Achaia, Bithynia, and Colosse are excellent.

Professor Smith's articles exhibit the same characteristics. Geographically they are good, but biblically they are deficient. In the article Capernaum he reaffirms his agreement with Robinson, Conder, Henderson, Ewing, and others, in preferring Khân Minyeh as the ancient site of the city. But also he says "Capernaum became the home of Jesus . . . after his rejection by the townsmen of Nazareth," a statement which is based upon Luke's arrangement of his gospel material, but contradicted by Mark and Matthew. Jesus removed to Capernaum, not because he was treated shabbily at Nazareth, but because Capernaum was the most suitable center for evangelistic work in Galilee. The article Bethlehem has just two sentences on the New Testament relations of the village, which is inexcusably meager. Inadequate also is the treatment of Paul's relations to Damascus. In the article Antipatris Dr. Smith inclines to Râs el 'Ain as the probable site, with Sandreczky, Wilson, and Conder. The articles Cæsarea and Decapolis are excellent.

The articles Bethany and Bethabara are by the editor, Professor Cheyne, who (with Grove and Wilson, against Conder in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*) finds this locality, supposed to be the site of Jesus' baptism by John (John 1:28), at Tell-Nimrîm (Beth-nimrah), northeast of Jericho on a tributary of the Jordan.

C. W. VOTAW.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

New Testament History.—As in the case of New Testament Introduction, the most important articles are written by German scholars, and are marked by the breadth of scholarship one would expect. They represent, however, a rather extreme critical position, and those by Professor Schmiedel are marked by persistent disparagement of Acts as a historical document. Perhaps as important an article as any of Professor Schmiedel's is that upon the term "Christian." It would be difficult to find a more complete presentation of the material. At the same time it must be said that it is difficult to assent to his conclusions, resting as they do upon what seems a somewhat arbitrary rejection of statements, not only in Acts, but also in Tacitus and Suetonius. He very properly calls Professor Ramsay to account for his easy use of the Pompeian inscription, but hardly gives him due credit upon matters of first importance. The elaborate and painstaking article of Professor von Soden upon the chronology of the New Testament is interesting when compared with that of Turner in the Hastings dictionary. Professor von Soden adopts the bi-paschal theory as to the length of the public ministry of Jesus, but does not present the evidence as fully as it might be stated, nor does he quite meet the objections to certain of his positions that could be raised from the fourth gospel, the chronological value of which he reduces to a minimum. Yet in his main contention of a short ministry he is probably near the truth. The articles by English writers are frequently disappointing, in that the important results of recent criticism are quite ignored. The articles by Professor Woodhouse, further, upon places in Greece, are good illustrations of articles written by classical rather than New Testament scholars. The only reason for the admission of such articles as Athens, Areopagus, Corinth, lies in their relations with the New Testament, and this is a phase which is almost uniformly disregarded. The article by Professor J. Armitage Robinson upon Church is more concerned with the patristic than the New Testament aspects of the subject, and puts interpretations upon passages in an ecclesiastical

rather than purely historical spirit. The same may be said of his other articles dealing with ecclesiastical matters. Those upon Apostle, Baptism, Bishop, and Deacon, though by no means silent as to modern investigations, might have been written at almost any time as well as at present, so indifferent are they to their results. It goes without saying that they find strange company in the articles of von Soden and Schmiedel. That they should disregard the method of biblical theology, however, is what we should expect after the contemptuous words of the editor as regards that science.

SHAILER MATHEWS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.